

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/681,327	03/19/2001	Jack Robert Smith	BUR920000098US1	BUR920000098US1 9570	
7590 06/02/2004			EXAMINER		
Dillon & Yudell LLP			VO, T	VO, TED T	
P.O. BOX 201720 Austin, TX 78720-1720			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,			2122		

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

11

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/681,327	SMITH ET AL.	/*/		
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Ted T. Vo	2122			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address			
THE REPLY FILED 22 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.					
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The da have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three more armed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate extension the final Office action; or (2) a	on fee under s set forth in		
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:				
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);					
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or					
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.					
NOTE:					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	I be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed ar	nendment		
5. ☑ The a) ☑ affidavit, b) ☑ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: Set		sidered but does NOT	place the		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were i	newly		
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w			l an		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	•				
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-5</u> .			•		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	oroved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)					
10. Other:					

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The Declaration and the Exhibit A filed on 4/22/04 fail to overcome the rejection of the Final office action, dated 4/8/04, because the statement given in the Declaration at page 2, item 3, attests that the creation date deleted from Exhibit A is prior to March 2002. Thus, this fails to antedate the applied reference of Chou et al., that is dated in March 2000.

TUANDAM

PATENT EXAMINER